



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# PROCEEDINGS.

Boston and Cambridge, May 21st, 1862.

THE Annual Meeting of the Society was held in Boston and Cambridge, Wednesday, May 21st, 1862, commencing at 10 o'clock A. M., at the room of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, in the Athenæum building, Boston.

The chair was taken by Prof. Beck, of Cambridge, who briefly explained to the Society the circumstances which caused the absence of its President from the meeting: he had recently sailed for Europe, for the benefit of his health, and especially in order to consult eminent foreign oculists with respect to his eyes, of the use of which he had been deprived during several months past. A resolution expressing the regret and sympathy of the Society was a little later offered by the Corresponding Secretary, and unanimously adopted, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Society sees with regret the absence of its honored President, Prof. Edward Robinson, D.D., of New York, and is pained to learn that he has been compelled by the state of his health, and especially by the impaired condition of his eye-sight, to cross the ocean for medical aid; and it would express its earnest hope that the voyage may prove successful, and that the health and strength, so important in this case to the interests of learning, may be restored and long preserved.

The Treasurer's report was presented, containing the following *résumé* of the receipts and expenditures of the year:

## RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 22nd, 1861,	-	-	-	-	\$557.22
Member's fees: one life-membership,	-	-	\$75.00		
ann. assessments for 1861-62,			395.00		
do. do. for previous years,			145.00		
do. do. for 1862-63,			5.00	620.00	
Sale of Journal,	-	-	-	57.71	
Total receipts during the year,	-	-	-	-	\$677.71
					\$1234.93

## EXPENDITURES.

Paper and printing for Journal, Vol VII (in part),	-	-	-	-	\$566.34
Other printing,	-	-	-	-	7.89
Binding books,	-	-	-	-	48.50
Expenses of Library, Cabinet, correspondence, etc.,	-	-	-	-	46.25
Total expenditures during the year,	-	-	-	-	\$668.98
Balance on hand, May 21st, 1862,	-	-	-	-	565.95
					\$1234.93

It was explained that the balance in the Treasury appeared greater than it actually was, because there was a larger outstanding liability

now than at the corresponding time last year, on account of the printing of the Part of the Journal, yet incomplete, which is to form the issue for 1861-62.

The Treasurer's accounts were audited by a committee, and accepted by the Society.

The Librarian presented and read a list of the donors to the Library and Cabinet during the year past, and described the several donations.\* He stated that the present number of titles of printed books contained in the Library was 2358, and of manuscripts, 117. About \$50 had been expended in binding.

The Committee of Publication informed the Society that the second half of the seventh volume of the Journal, due to the members at or about the time of this meeting, was not yet through the press, and that its distribution would be unavoidably deferred for some time longer. The Number was to contain, besides the usual miscellanies, three principal articles; of these, two were presented at the last meeting, viz. Mr. Webb on the Dravidian Languages, and Prof. Whitney on Lepsius's Standard Alphabet: the third, the text of the Atharva-Veda Prâtichâkhyâ, with translation and notes, by Prof. Whitney, which would be presented at this meeting, was already partly in type, and was being pushed forward as rapidly as circumstances permitted.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the names of the following persons, who, having accepted election to Corporate Membership of the Society since its last meeting, were newly enrolled in its list of members:

Mr. George L. Ditson, Burlington, Vt.

Mr. Pelatiah Perit, New Haven.

Mr. Charles E. West, LL.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

He farther reported the decease during the past six months of the following Corporate and Corresponding Members:

Pres. Cornelius C. Felton, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Samuel H. Turner, D.D., New York.

Pres. John Wheeler, D.D., Burlington, Vt.

Rev. Elijah C. Bridgman, D.D., Shanghai, China.

Rev. Harrison G. O. Dwight, D.D., Constantinople.

Rev. Benjamin C. Meigs, lately of Ceylon.

P. E. LeVailant de Florival, Paris.

This announcement, containing a greater than usual number of venerated names, was not suffered to pass without due expression of the Society's sense of the losses it had sustained, and a tribute of admiring respect to the memories of the deceased. Dr. Francis, of Cambridge, gave an eloquent sketch of the life and labors of Pres. Felton, and an estimate of his character as a man and as a scholar. Dr. Anderson spoke in the same strain, and added also a more particular statement of his important aid to the Society in the early years of its weakness. Dr. Anderson then went on to describe the character, as laborers in the missionary work and in the cause of science, of Drs. Bridgman and Dwight and Mr. Meigs, and was followed upon the same subject by Rev.

---

\* A list of the accessions to the Library and Cabinet since May 1861 will be found appended to this report of Proceedings.

Mr. Treat and Rev. Dr. Allen, and farther, by Rev. Dr. Dean, of Shanghai, in an especial tribute to his late fellow-laborer in China. The Corresponding Secretary added a few words respecting the position and services of Dr. Turner and Prof. de Florival.

The Directors presented to the meeting the names of several gentlemen, recommending that they be elected Corporate Members of the Society, and they were, upon ballot held, elected without dissent.

The Directors farther gave information that they had reappointed the Committee of Publication of last year. Also, that they had accepted an invitation of the members of the Society at Princeton, N. J., to hold the next Semi-annual meeting in that city, and had appointed it to be held there on the 15th of October next, designating Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, Alexander I. Cotheal, Esq., of New York, and the Corresponding Secretary, as Committee of Arrangements for the meeting.

The Business Committee for the present meeting announced that they proposed that, in accordance with the usual custom of late years, the morning session should adjourn at or before 1 o'clock, and that the Society should reassemble at 4 o'clock, at the residence of Dr. Beck, in Cambridge: and the proposal was, upon motion, accepted by the Society.

The election of a board of officers for the ensuing year being next in order, the following gentlemen, proposed by a nominating committee, were balloted for and duly chosen:

<i>President</i>	—Prof. EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D.,	of New York.
<i>Vice-Presidents</i>	{ Prof. CHARLES BECK, Ph. D.,	" Cambridge.
	{ Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D.,	" Boston.
	{ Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D. D., LL. D.,	" New Haven.
<i>Corresponding Secretary</i>	—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY,	" New Haven.
<i>Secr. of Classical Section</i>	—Prof. JAMES HADLEY,	" New Haven.
<i>Recording Secretary</i>	—Mr. EZRA ABBOT,	" Cambridge.
<i>Treasurer</i>	—Mr. D. C. GILMAN,	" New Haven.
<i>Librarian</i>	—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY,	" New Haven.
<i>Directors</i>	{ Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D.,	" Boston.
	{ Mr. J. G. COGSWELL, LL. D.,	" New York.
	{ Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D.,	" Princeton.
	{ Prof. J. J. OWEN, D. D.,	" New York.
	{ Prof. A. P. PEABODY, D. D.,	" Cambridge.
	{ Dr. CHARLES PICKERING,	" Boston.
	{ Prof. E. E. SALISBURY,	" New Haven.

The Corresponding Secretary laid upon the table the correspondence of the half-year, and described its character. The only parts of it which he proposed to read were two papers which had been sent to him to be laid before the present meeting. These were accordingly called for first among the communications to be presented.

1. Brief Notes on the Language of the Kemi Tribe, in Arracan; by Rev. L. Stilson, lately missionary of the American Baptist Missionary Union in Farther India.

A letter from Mr. Stilson, accompanying this paper, gave an account of the circumstances which led to his making acquaintance with the tribe, and of his residence among them for several months in 1848, for the purpose of gaining some knowledge

of their language, and preparing a system for its reduction to writing, in the Burmese character. A spelling book and reader were prepared by him, specimens of which were sent with the paper. Circumstances, however, had caused the relinquishment of the plan formed by the Missionary Union for establishing a mission with the tribe, intercourse with it had terminated, the books prepared had not been used, and no European had since learned the language. The paper, which is expected to appear in a future number of the Journal, contained a summary presentation of the Keini grammar, with brief vocabulary, sentences, Lord's Prayer, and analysis.

2. On the Species or Derivative Forms of Semitic Verbs, by Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, N. J.

In this brief paper, Prof. Green gave a concise exhibition of the Semitic scheme of conjugations, founding it upon the Arabic, as the most complete and regular among them. He first pointed out the fundamental character of the Semitic roots, as trilateral, and as developing into forms in great part by internal modification, instead of, as in the Indo-European languages, by external additions alone. The first form of Semitic conjugation was produced by vocalizing the consonants, as *qatala*; this was strengthened by duplication, prolongation, or prefixion of a vowel, to form the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th conjugations, with transitive, intensive, or causative meaning, as *qattala*, *qátala*, *aqtala*; and again, with duplication at the end, the 9th and 11th, or color conjugations, as *qtalla*, *qtálle*. The formation of the passive of these and the other forms was by a weaker vocalization, as *qutla*, *quttila*, etc. Middles were derived by the prefixion of reflexive pronominal elements, *n* and *t*, giving, from the first, the 7th and 8th, as *inqatala*, *iqtatala*, from the 2nd and 3rd, the 5th and 6th, as *taqattala*, *tagátala*, and from the 4th, with the help also of a sibilant, the 10th, *istaqatala*. The Hebrew conjugations are identical with some of these, formed with the same materials and in the same manner. The other dialects have lost all means of forming middles and passives except by prefixing *t*. The Hebrew rarely, and the Ethiopic regularly, produces compound forms, ingrafting one conjugational sign upon another.

The comparative scheme of conjugations is then as follows:

ARABIC.	Simple.	Intensive.	Trans. or Rel.	Causative.	Intens., Color.
Active (with passive)	1	2	3	4	9, 11
Middle (with passive)	7, 8	5	6	10	
ETHIOPIA.					
Active	1	2	3	4	(2×4 3×4)
Middle	8	5	6	10	(2×10 3×10)
ARAMAIC.					
Active	<i>Peal</i>	<i>Pael</i>	<i>Aphel</i> and <i>Shaphel</i> .		
Middle	<i>Ithpeel</i>	<i>Ithpaal</i>	<i>Ittaphal</i> and <i>Ishtaphal</i> .		
HEBREW.					
Active	<i>Kal</i>	<i>Piel</i>	<i>Hiphil</i> .		
Passive		<i>Pual</i>	<i>Hophal</i> .		
Middle	<i>Niphal</i>	<i>Hithpaal</i>			

The presentation of communications was resumed in the afternoon, at the meeting in Cambridge.

3. The Atharva-Veda Prâtiçâkhya, or Çaunakiyâ Caturâdhyâyikâ: Text, Translation, and Notes, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

This work, which is to occupy a considerable part of the forthcoming half-volume of the Society's Journal, was laid before the meeting by Prof. Whitney. He read, by way of specimens of it, the introduction, and characteristic passages of the translation, with the notes upon them. He then described the position and value in the Hindu literature of the class of works of which this was one, the system of

schools of Vedic study in which they grew up, and the character of the grammatical science which they represented.

The subjects touched upon led to a general discussion of the probable mode of transmission of the Vedas and of the *Prātiśākhya*s themselves, and on the extent to which the memory may be trained to preserve long literary compositions without the aid of writing.

4. On Chwolson's "Remains of Ancient Babylonian Literature in Arabic Translations," by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven.

Prof. Hadley began by referring to a former communication, presented Oct. 18, 1860, in which his aim was to describe the memoir of Chwolson, rather than to criticise it. He spoke of the discussions excited by the startling announcement of an extant Babylonian literature, as old, nearly, as the *Pentateuch*; and mentioned particularly the adverse criticisms of Renan and Gutschmidt—Renan's (a full analysis of his memoir) in the *Journal de l'Institut* for 1860, and Gutschmidt's in the 15th volume of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. He then proceeded to give a condensed synopsis of the objections urged against the antiquity and authenticity of the writings which Ibn Wahshiyyah, about 900 A.D., professed to translate from the Nabathæan (or Babylonian) language into Arabic. The following were specified as the main grounds of objection:—1. The way in which they represent Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, and other biblical personages, with legendary features, such as appear in Rabbinic, Christian, and Mohammedan traditions.—2. The numerous references which they make to the Greeks (or Ionians), as having a prose literature known to the Babylonians and looked upon by them with jealousy. Also, allusions to Greek mythology, and traces of Pythagorean and New-Platonic ideas.—3. Apparent allusions to the religious festivals of the Christians, and to their monastic system, as developed in the East.—4. The spirit and character of these writings, diffuse, trivial, rationalistic, and in general unlike the known productions of very early times.—5. Their total absence of agreement, and even of connection, with the notices of Babylonian antiquity found in the fragments of Berosus and in other sources. It was shown that these arguments, taken as a whole, are unanswerable, and that the Nabathæan writings must accordingly be recognized as forgeries. As to the time when they were forged, Prof. Hadley stated the views of Renan, who regards them as composed in an Aramaean dialect, shortly before the rise of Mohammedanism, and of Gutschmidt, who holds that (excepting, perhaps, the one ascribed to Tenkelusha) they were, all of them, productions of Ibn Wahshiyyah himself; and then gave his reasons for preferring the latter opinion.

5. On the Historical Credibility of the Reported Burning of the Alexandrian Library by order of the Caliph Omar, by Prof. Convers Francis, D.D., of Cambridge.

This was a full and elaborate discussion of the historical point which formed its subject. Its author assembled and reviewed the information handed down to us respecting the libraries assembled at Alexandria during its flourishing period, and their fates under the Christian domination down to the time of the Mohammedan invasion, arguing that they had greatly suffered prior to the latter event, and that the continued existence of so colossal a collection was not probable. He then traced the popular story respecting the destruction of the library to its earliest sources, which he showed to be considerably posterior to the alleged event, while no notice of it was found in authors more nearly contemporary. He examined the story itself in the light of its own intrinsic probability and the credibility of its details, indicating its weak points, and also in the light of its relation to the character of the Mohammedan conquerors. His conclusions were decidedly unfavorable to the trustworthiness of the narrative.

The time of adjournment having arrived, the Society separated, to come together again at Princeton, N. J., on Wednesday, Oct. 15th, 1862.